



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,278	08/13/2007	Nigel Malcolm Lindner	F3343(C)	2847
201 7590 10/01/2008 UNILEVER PATENT GROUP 800 SYLVAN AVENUE AG West S. Wing ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS, NJ 07632-3100				
EXAMINER				
CHAWLA, JYOTI				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/01/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/582,278

Applicant(s)

LINDNER ET AL.

Examiner

JYOTI CHAWLA

Art Unit

1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/55/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/28/2007.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-10 are pending and examined in the application.

Specification

The attempt to incorporate subject matter into this application by reference to WO 99/37673 and WO 01/83534 as stated on page 5, line 16 of the original disclosure is ineffective because it excludes the root words "incorporate" and/or "reference", which have been omitted. See 37 CFR 1.57(b)(1); the reference document is not clearly identified as *required by 37 CFR 1.57(b)(2)*.

The incorporation by reference will not be effective until correction is made to comply with 37 CFR 1.57(b), (c), or (d). If the incorporated material is relied upon to meet any outstanding objection, rejection, or other requirement imposed by the Office, the correction must be made within any time period set by the Office for responding to the objection, rejection, or other requirement for the incorporation to be effective.

Compliance will not be held in abeyance with respect to responding to the objection, rejection, or other requirement for the incorporation to be effective. In no case may the correction be made later than the close of prosecution as defined in 37 CFR 1.114(b), or abandonment of the application, whichever occurs earlier.

Any correction inserting material by amendment that was previously incorporated by reference must be accompanied by a statement that the material being inserted is the material incorporated by reference and the amendment contains no new matter. 37 CFR 1.57(f).

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 4, the phrase "which frozen confections" is suggested to be --wherein the frozen confections-- in order to indicate the limitations on the frozen confections. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1,148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

(A) Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fenn et al (US 2001/0048962) in view of Jones (WO 96/29896).

Regarding claims 1 and 4, Fenn et al., hereinafter Fenn, teaches a method of making frozen food product, such as, water ices, sherbet, sorbet, ice milk, etc (Publication paragraphs [0050] and [0045, lines 2-3]) comprising discrete elements of the water ice containing ice structuring protein (ISP) or antifreeze peptide (AFP) (Publication

paragraphs [0052]). Fenn teaches that the level of solids more than 4% and preferably more than 30%, and up to 70% (Publication [0051]), which includes the solids content of at least 15% by weight, as instantly claimed.

The reference also teaches that ISP/AFP acts in many ways to modify the frozen food product

- AFP lowers the freezing temperature of the solution (Publication [0005]).
- AFP has significant ice-recrystallization inhibition properties, i.e., ice crystal growth suppression (Publication [0006]), i.e., agitation is not required to make a smooth frozen product.
- AFP has the ability to influence the shape of ice crystals (Publication [0007]).
- AFP also inhibits the activity of ice nucleating substances (Publication [0008]).

The reference also teaches that ISP/AFP makes it possible to formulate frozen food products (ice-creams and water ices) that are relatively hard and brittle on one hand with improved ice-recrystallization properties on the other, i.e., the water ice or ice cream can be frozen in a static freezer. Since the AFP/ISP retards the growth of ice crystals, it would also retard the adjacent frozen confections or confection pieces to stick to one another as instantly claimed. Further ISP/AFP helps in retaining the desirable shape or size of the frozen food product and the ice crystals in the food would not increase in size significantly and thus there is no deterioration in the texture of the frozen food product upon keeping.

Fenn teaches that when ISP/AFP is added to the food product then the average ice crystal size of less than 20 μm , and preferably from 5 to 15 μm (Publication [0039]) which makes the size of the ice crystal such that the frozen product remains fluid and that the AFP/ISP used is the one that has good ice-recrystallization properties. The reference teaches of frozen confections such as water ices and sherbert or sorbet as discussed above, however the reference does not teach the average size or volume of water ice particles as instantly claimed. However, the crystal size of less than 20 μm , and preferably from 5 to 15 μm (Publication [0039]), as taught by Fenn is small enough that frozen ice confections will have an average volume of less than 1 ml and minimum

average volume of less than 0.5 ml as instantly claimed. Also, freezing ice confections in sizes as claimed instantly has been known in the art (WO 96/29896), where Jones teaches of making ice confections in the shape of small beads. Jones teaches of frozen confection spheres or beads that are free flowing when frozen. The frozen confection as taught by Jones can be made using a dropper assembly with orifice of size 0.03125 inches, i.e., 0.8 mm and the droplets of the confection are frozen quickly so as to form beads or spheres of frozen confection. Based on the viscosity of the liquid confection, the beads of the frozen confection formed can be made smaller or larger, however, it was known to make discrete ice confections at the time of the invention as taught by Jones.

Regarding the size of the frozen confection pieces or particles or spheres as recited in claim 1, it is noted that since the composition of the ice confection with solids content in the range claimed was known, the confection composition also included the same type of ISP /AFP in the recited amount was also known at the time of the invention, therefore, the step of freezing the ice confection as to form a discrete pieces of the frozen confection does not provide patentable distinction to the claims, absent any clear and convincing evidence and arguments to the contrary.

Regarding claims 2-3, Fenn teaches of a frozen food product comprising of ISP /AFP. The reference also teaches frozen confections that have texture contrast. The frozen confections taught by Fenn also teach discrete elements in the confection, e.g., core of one ice confection can be coated with composition containing ISP/AFP to create layered confection (Publication [0052-0064]). Thus, the reference does teach of discrete ice cream or milk-ice confections that contact other iced confections, as instantly claimed.

Regarding claim 5, Fenn teaches that the aeration of the frozen product is optional (Publication [0041-0042]). Thus the reference teaches that the frozen ice confections comprising ISP/AFP can be made without aeration step, i.e., unaerated ice cream or milk ice, as is instantly claimed.

Regarding claim 6, Fenn teaches that the level of solids more than 4 wt% and up to 70% (Publication [0051]), which includes the solids content of at least 15%, as instantly claimed.

Regarding claim 7, Fenn teaches of butter oil in an ice cream composition in the amount of 8% by weight of the composition (Publication [0053], Table), which fall within applicant's recited range of 2-15% fat for ice cream product.

Regarding claims 8-9, Fenn teaches that the preferred ISP/AFP is derived from type III fish and most preferred HPLC-12 (Publication [0038]), as is instantly claimed.

Regarding claim 10, Fenn teaches that the preferred level of ISP/ AFP in the frozen confections, such as ice creams and water ice is in the range of 0.0001 to 0.5wt% (Publication [0045]), which includes the range of at least 0.0005wt%, as instantly claimed.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Note: Applications 10/582,278 and 10/582,372 have 3 inventors in common.

Claims 1-3, 6-10 of the current application 10/582,278 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3, 6, 8-12 of copending Application No. 10/582,372. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both applications claim frozen confectionery comprising plurality of discrete frozen confections and each discrete frozen confection being able to contact directly other discrete frozen confections in the product. The frozen confections comprise an ice structuring protein (ISP) and have an average volume of less than 1 ml. The frozen confections comprise at least 0.0005 wt % of ISP and 2-15% fat in ice cream compositions. Claims in both applications also recite that the ISP is a fish type III ISP, which is a type III AFP HPLC 12. The overlapping claims differ in the minimal amount of solids in the frozen confection. Claim 6 of current application 10/582,278 claims "at least about 15 wt% solids" whereas, claim 6 of application 10/582,372 claims "at least about 6 wt% solids".

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JYOTI CHAWLA whose telephone number is (571)272-8212. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith Hendricks can be reached on (571) 272-1401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JC
Examiner
Art Unit 1794

/KEITH D. HENDRICKS/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794